APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,412	02/13/2001	Gary P. Mousseau	555255012194	3123

7590   01/07/2004

David B. Cochran, Esq.
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER
EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/782,412	MOUSSEAU ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Bradley Edelman	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,6-10,12 15,17-20
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is a first action on the merits of this application. Claims 1-37

are presented for examination.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the status of

the parent case, mentioned on page 1 of the specification, must be updated.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1.   Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

In considering claim 14, the phrase "the plurality of message senders" on lines 2-

3 lacks sufficient antecedent basis. In addition, the phrase "the first address associated

with the host system" on line 5 lacks sufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 18 depends from claim 14 and is thus rejected as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by AirMobile (AirMobile Wireless Comm Client for cc:Mail, Motorola, 1995).

In considering claim 1, AirMobile discloses a method of redirecting data items

from a host system to a mobile data communication device, comprising steps of:

Configuring a triggering event at the host system (p. 17, ¶ 3, "enable/disable");

Detecting that the triggering event has occurred at the host system and

generating a trigger (this occurs when the redirection system is enabled);

Receiving data items at the host system, and in response to the trigger and as

data items are received at the host system, continuously redirecting the received data

items from the host system to the mobile communication device (p. 17, ¶ 3, "when

'enabled' AirMobile will ensure messages are automatically downloaded to your cc:Mail

Mobile account from the server automatically...");

Determining whether each data item includes an attachment, and if so,

determining the type of attachment (p. 17, ¶ 4-5, "Text Attach" and "File Attach");

Providing attachment redirection information (p. 17, "filters"; p. 43, "Configuring

AirMobile Granular Message Filters"); and

Redirecting the attachment in accordance with the attachment redirection

information (p. 43, same section, wherein "the granular filters enable you to download

only specific portions of the message," including "text attachments" and "file

attachments").

In considering claim 2, AirMobile further discloses that the attachment redirection

information includes one or more attachment types that the mobile communication

device can receive and process ("Text" and "File" types).

In considering claim 3, AirMobile further discloses that the attachment redirection

information includes one or more attachment types ("Text" or "File" types) and one or

more associated commands which control processing of each attachment type by the

host system (p. 44, selecting "Text Attach" and/or "File Attach" options).

In considering claim 4, AirMobile further discloses a command for storing a data

item attachment to a data store accessible by the host system (p. 31, "Server based

filters for downloads;" p. 45, "Text attach," "File attach"; wherein message attachments

designated to not be attached will be stored at the host system and not pushed to the

wireless device).

In considering claim 6, AirMobile further discloses that the one or more commands includes a command for redirecting a data item attachment to the mobile communication device (p. 45, "Text Attach" section and "File Attach" section).

In considering claim 7, AirMobile further discloses that the step of providing attachment redirection information is provided by information transmitted by the mobile communication device (p. 37, last paragraph, "your client may send messages, send profile change transactions...").

In considering claim 36, AirMobile discloses an attachment forwarding method comprising the steps of:

Receiving an electronic message at a first system (cc:Mail server), the electronic message including an attachment having an attachment type (i.e. file attachment or text attachment; pp. 43-45);

Redirecting the electronic message from the first system to the second system (p. 31, ¶ 1; pp. 43-45);

Generating an attachment processing command at the second system and transmitting the attachment processing command to the first system (p. 37, last paragraph); and

Redirecting the attachment to the second system (pp. 43-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 5, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over AirMobile, in view of Theimer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692, hereinafter

"Theimer").

In considering claim 5, AirMobile discloses commands for either holding the

attachments at the host system or forwarding the attachments to the mobile device.

However, AirMobile does not disclose a command for forwarding the attachments to an

external machine compatible with the attachment. Nonetheless, redirection of a

message from a host system to an external machine compatible with the message is

well known, as evidenced by Theimer. In a similar art, Theimer discloses a system for

selectively delivering electronic mail messages to one or more users who are using a

mobile communication device (col. 24, lines 49-55), wherein the messages will be

redirected from a host (server) to an appropriate display device according to device

characteristics, the context, and the message characteristics (col. 25, lines 17-38).

Thus, given the teaching of Theimer, a person having ordinary skill in the art

would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of expanding the system

taught by AirMobile to redirect the un-forwarded attachments in the AirMobile system to

a nearby external machine, so that even if the wireless device cannot receive the

attachment, the user can still view it immediately at a nearby location (see Theimer, col. 25, lines 23-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to forward the attachments taught by AirMobile to a user via an external machine, as taught by Theimer.

In considering claim 8, Theimer further discloses that the external machine can be a printer (page 5, line 31, "printer 22"). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to forward the attachments taught by AirMobile to a printer, so that users could easily view a printout of the large attached graphics or other large files without having to use large amounts of memory space on the wireless device.

In considering claim 9, Theimer does not disclose forwarding messages to a fax machine. Nonetheless, a fax machine can serve the same purpose as a printer in printing files. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use a fax machine for forwarding the attachments taught by AirMobile, for the same reason as using a printer.

4.   Claims 5, 9, 10, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, in view of Srinivasan (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,862).

In considering claim 5, AirMobile discloses commands for either holding the attachments at the host system or forwarding the attachments to the mobile device. However, AirMobile does not disclose a command for forwarding the attachments to an external machine compatible with the attachment. Nonetheless, redirection of a message from a host system to an external machine compatible with the message is

well known, as evidenced by Srinivasan. In a similar art, Srinivasan discloses a system

for selectively delivering electronic messages sent to a particular subscriber to one of

multiple external communication devices (col. 2, lines 49-61), according to device and

message characteristics (col. 3, lines 33-42).

Thus, given the teaching of Srinivasan, a person having ordinary skill in the art

would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of expanding the system

taught by AirMobile to redirect the un-forwarded attachments in the AirMobile system to

a nearby external machine, so that even if the wireless device cannot receive the

attachment, the user can still view it immediately at a nearby location. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to forward the attachments taught by AirMobile to a user via

an external machine, as taught by Srinivasan.

In considering claim 9, Srinivasan further discloses forwarding messages to a fax

machine (col. 3, line 30). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in

the art to forward the attachments taught by AirMobile to a fax machine, so that users

could easily view a printout of the large attached graphics or other large files without

having to use large amounts of memory space on the wireless device.

In considering claim 10, Srinivasan further discloses that forwarded files can be

sound files, and further discloses that the external machine is a voice mail system

("voice mail"; Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 31, 38-41). It would have been obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to include voice attachments in the system taught by

AirMobile, and to forward the attachments to a voice mail system, so that a user can

receive and access important voice messages from any location.

In considering claim 37, AirMobile discloses a redirection system comprising:

A plurality of mobile data communication devices, and a plurality of configuration

files associated with the mobile devices (pp. 9-10, wherein the system manages a

plurality of user accounts), each configuration file including information regarding the

preferences of the mobile device ("filters");

A message server that receives data items having attachments (p. 10, ¶ 5, 6);

A message redirector configured to redirect the received data items to the

plurality of mobile devices (p. 10, ¶ 6); and

An attachment detector that identifies one or more attachments associated with

the data items, and based on the preferences of the mobile device, forwards the

attachment to the mobile device (pp. 40-45, "File Attach" and "Text Attach" filters).

However, AirMobile does not disclose that the preferences of the mobile device

actually include mobile device capabilities. Nonetheless, systems that forward

messages to wireless devices according to the device characteristics are well known, as

evidenced by Srinivasan. In a similar art, Srinivasan discloses a system for forwarding

any messages received in a mailbox to one of a plurality of different types of devices,

according to the type of message and/or type of device, and further converts messages

depending on the preferred or available type of media (col. 3, lines 28-42, 55-56). Thus,

given the teaching of Srinivasan, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have

readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including device capability

information in the configuration files taught by AirMobile, so that only device-compatible

messages are received at the mobile device, while non-compatible messages can still

be viewed via other devices, thereby providing optimum flexibility for routing of different

types of messages (see Srinivasan, col. 1, lines 41-45). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to use the device capability preferences taught by Srinivasan as the attachment

preferences in the system taught by AirMobile.

5.   Claims 11, 13-21, and 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over AirMobile, in view of Narayanaswamy (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,358).

        In considering claim 11, AirMobile discloses a method of forwarding message

attachments from a host system to a mobile data communications device, comprising

the steps of:

        Configuring an attachment profile at the host system for the mobile device,

wherein the attachment profile indicates the types of attachments that the mobile device

should process (pp. 44-45, "Text Attach," "File Attach");

        Receiving messages at the host system, wherein the messages include a

plurality of attachment types (i.e. text and file attachments);

        Determining whether the mobile data communication device should process the

plurality of types of attachment types using the attachment profile (i.e. it checks whether

the attachment boxes were selected); and

Forwarding the attachments that can be processed by the mobile device from the host system to the mobile device (i.e. if the box is checked, the attachment is forwarded to the user's mobile device).

However, AirMobile does not disclose that the attachment profile includes the attachments that the mobile device *can* process. AirMobile instead discloses that the user can arbitrarily select which attachments should be sent to the mobile device. Nonetheless, the use of an attachment profile to determine whether to forward attachments to a mobile device based on the types of attachments that the device can process (i.e. based on mobile device characteristics) is well known, as evidenced by Narayanaswamy. In a similar art, Narayanaswamy discloses a system for forwarding attachments to a mobile device, wherein the system looks at a mobile device id and compares it to an attachment profile to determine whether to forward the attachment directly to the mobile device or whether to convert the attachment first before forwarding it to the mobile device (col. 5, lines 47-67; col. 6, lines 5-20). Given this teaching, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using a device-based attachment profile such as described by Narayanaswamy instead of, or in addition to the user-selectable attachment profile taught by AirMobile, so that attachments that cannot be processed by the mobile device are not sent to it, thereby reducing the amount of wasted network bandwidth. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the device-based attachment profile taught by Narayanaswamy in the message forwarding system taught by AirMobile.

In considering claim 13, AirMobile further discloses that the received messages are directed to a first address at the host system (cc:Mail address) and further discloses configuring a redirection event, generating a trigger based on the redirection event, and forwarding the attachments in response to the trigger (p. 16, wherein the event is the user setting the User Profile Configuration, and the trigger is setting the "Enable" button).

In considering claim 14, Examiner understands the claim to mean that multiple senders can send messages to the mobile device user, and that replies can be sent to the multiple senders. Examiner also understands the claim to mean that the host system has a "first address" that is used as an originating address. Thus, as understood, AirMobile further discloses:

receiving the messages at the mobile device from a plurality of senders (p. 31, "Server based filters for downloads"; p. 42, "author" filters);

generating reply messages at the mobile device to be sent to the plurality of senders and transmitting the reply to the host (p. 31, "Client based filters for uploads," wherein replies are inherent in e-mail and use the same mail processing steps as messages originally generated at the sending device);

receiving the reply messages at the host and configuring the address information such that reply messages use the e-mail address associated with the host system as the originating address, such that messages generated at either the host system or the mobile device share the first address (p. 31, same section, wherein messages sent from

the outbox will have the same e-mail address as the originator, whether they are

created at a desktop device, or at the wireless mobile device); and

transmitting the reply messages from the host system to the plurality of message

senders (p. 31, ¶ 2).

In considering claim 15, AirMobile further discloses storing information regarding

the configuration of the mobile device at the host system (p. 16, "user profile").

In considering claim 16, AirMobile further discloses that the configuration

information includes the network address of the mobile device (p. 16, "remote radio id").

In considering claim 17, Narayanaswamy further discloses that the configuration

information includes the type of mobile device (col. 5, lines 46-52, wherein the device

capabilities signify a certain type of device).

In considering claim 18, AirMobile further discloses that the received messages

are addressed using a sender address and a receiver address (inherent in e-mail), the

method further comprising the steps of:

Determining whether the receiver address is associated with the mobile device,

and if the receiver address is associated with the mobile device, then determining a

network address of the mobile device and repackaging the messages into electronic

envelopes addressed using the receiver address and the network address of the mobile

device (i.e. the server will check the user profile to determine whether to forward the

cc:Mail message to the wireless device, and will then forward the messages

accordingly, using the terminal id to address the messages to the wireless device (pp.

16-17, 30-31); and

After receiving the redirected messages at the mobile device, extracting the

messages from the electronic envelopes and displaying the messages at the mobile

device using the sender address and the receiver address, so that it appears as though

the mobile device is the host system (p. 31, wherein the cc:Mail messages is forwarded

to the wireless device and displayed in the same manner as cc:Mail messages sent to

the LAN, and wherein the "electronic envelope" is inherent, since all messages sent via

a wireless or wired network are sent in an electronic envelope).

In considering claim 19, Narayanaswamy further discloses that the attachments

can be sound files (col. 2, lines 55-56). It would have been obvious to include sound

files as attachments in the system taught by AirMobile so that blind users could still use

the e-mail program.

In considering claim 20, AirMobile further discloses that the events include

external events, internal events, or networked events (i.e. the user setting the enable

button).

In considering claim 21, AirMobile further discloses that the external event is a message from the mobile device to start redirection (p. 11; p. 37, last paragraph).

In considering claim 25, AirMobile further discloses that the networked event includes messages to begin redirection from computer systems other than the mobile device, which are connected to the host system via a wired network (pp. 12, 16, "personal computer").

In considering claim 26, AirMobile further discloses that the mobile device is a wirelessly enabled laptop computer (p. 9, Fig. 1-1).

In considering claim 27, the combined teaching of AirMobile and Narayanaswamy further teaches that the device is equipped to receive both sound and non-voice data messages (Narayanaswamy, col. 2, lines 55-56, "sound"). Although neither reference explicitly discloses "voice" messages, it would have been obvious for the sound messages to include voice messages, so that users (especially blind users) can receive electronic messages without having to read them.

In considering claims 28-33, AirMobile further discloses the claimed preferred list for limiting redirection, and the claimed methods of altering the preferred list (pp. 40-45, "Message Filtering").

6.   Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

AirMobile, in view of Narayanaswamy, and further in view of Kuki (EP Pat. No. 772,327

A2).

        In considering claim 22, although the combined system taught by AirMobile and

Narayanaswamy discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to

disclose that the internal event is a calendar alarm. AirMobile, instead teaches that the

event is the user manually selecting to activate the message forwarding system.

Narayanaswamy remains silent regarding the event and trigger functions. Nonetheless,

forwarding messages from a host computer in a similar way to the server forwarding

taught by AirMobile and Narayanaswamy, wherein message forwarding is triggered in

response to an internal calendar alarm is well known, as evidenced by Kuki. In a similar

art, Kuki discloses a system for selectively forwarding messages from a host system

(host computer 200) to a wireless mobile device (wireless communication terminal 100)

wherein message forwarding is triggered by a calendar alarm event (col. 6, lines 22-30;

col. 7, lines 10-20, "forwarding time and time interval of a desired mail"). The Kuki

system actually forwards messages from a desktop host, rather than a server host.

Given this teaching a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily

recognized the desirability and advantages of using a calendar alarm to trigger the

message forwarding in the system taught by AirMobile and Narayanaswamy, to control

network bandwidth usage and to prevent the downloading of large amounts of data

during peak usage time periods. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use an

internal calendar alarm, as taught by Kuki, to trigger the message forwarding in the

system taught by AirMobile and Narayanaswamy.

7.   Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

AirMobile, in view of Narayanaswamy, further in view of Kuki, and further in view of

Kumomura (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,219).

In considering claim 23, although the teaching of AirMobile, Narayanaswamy,

and Kuki teaches substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that

the internal event is a screen saver activation. Nonetheless, activating e-mail

forwarding based on a screen saver activation is well known, as evidenced by

Kumomura. In a similar art, Kumomura discloses a system for forwarding e-mail from a

host system (client) to another device, wherein the forwarding is triggered by a screen

saver activation ("when a screen saver is operating," col. 4, lines 50-67). Thus, given

the teaching of Kumomura, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily

recognized the desirability and advantages of activating the e-mail forwarding at the

host system taught by Kuki, AirMobile, and Narayanaswamy, based on a screen saver

activation, as taught by Kumomura, to allow users who have likely stepped away from

their devices (due to a long period of inactivity) to receive messages at a different

location (see Kumomura, col. 4, lines 58-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

use the screen saver activation forwarding feature taught by Kumomura in the system

taught by Kuki, AirMobile, and Narayanaswamy.

In considering claim 24, although Kumomura does not discuss a keyboard timeout, Examiner takes official notice that keyboard timeouts are well known, and that keyboard timeouts are a typical way of determining inactivity at a computer terminal. Given this knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of triggering e-mail forwarding in the system taught by Kuki, AirMobile, Narayanaswamy, and Kumomura, for the same reasons as using a screen saver as a trigger.

8.   Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,848), in view of Narayanaswamy.

In considering claim 34, Arnold discloses a method of forwarding message attachments, comprising the steps of:

Receiving an electronic message ("e-mail message") at a host system, the electronic message including a message body and one or more attachments ("attachment 202," col. 4, lines 6-8);

Forwarding the message body and information regarding the identity and type of the attachment to a mobile data communication device (col. 4, lines 15, 19-24, "an attachment meeting certain criteria... is automatically detached, place on a remote site, preferably a Web server, and substituted with a pointer to the Web server... The message is then sent to the recipient(s)");

Transmitting a command from the device to the host system instructing the host system how to process the one or more attachments (col. 4, lines 33-42, wherein a user

clicks on the link to the attachment to instruct the host system to send the attachments);
and

In response to the command, the host system processing the one or more
attachments by forwarding the attachment to the device (col. 4, lines 40-42, wherein the
attachment is downloaded to the mobile device).

However, Arnold does not disclose that the mobile device is a wireless device.
Nonetheless, forwarding message attachments to wireless mobile devices is well
known, as evidenced by Narayanaswamy (see Abstract; col. 2, lines 50-56). Thus,
given the teaching of Narayanaswamy, a person having ordinary skill in the art would
have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using wireless mobile
devices in the system taught by Arnold, so that users can roam freely with their devices
without worrying about finding an Internet hook-up. Therefore, it would have been
obvious for the mobile devices taught by Arnold to comprise wireless mobile devices, as
taught by Narayanaswamy.

9.   Claims 12 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over AirMobile, in view of Narayanaswamy, in view of Srinivasan.

In considering claim 12, the combined system of AirMobile and Narayanaswamy
teaches checking for an attachment type and comparing it to device capabilities, and
then either forwarding the attachment to the mobile device based on the comparison
(perhaps converting the message if necessary) or not forwarding the attachment to the
mobile device. However, the combined system does not disclose sending the

attachments that cannot be processed at the mobile device to a separate device for

processing. Nonetheless, sending messages to an appropriate external device for

processing is well known, as evidenced by Srinivasan. In a similar art, Srinivasan

discloses a system for forwarding e-mails messages to users, wherein the messages

are sent to an appropriate device for processing, according to message and device

characteristics (col. 2, lines 49-61, "messages may be routed to a variety of different

types of destinations also including, but not limited to, facsimile machines, pager

systems, voice mail systems..."). Given the teaching of Srinivasan, a person having

ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of

allowing the attachments in the system taught by AirMobile and Narayanaswamy to be

sent to external devices, so that only device-compatible messages are received at the

mobile device, while non-compatible messages can still be viewed via other devices,

thereby providing optimum flexibility for routing of different types of messages (see

Srinivasan, col. 1, lines 41-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to forward

certain attachments to external devices, as taught by Srinivasan, in the message

forwarding system taught by AirMobile and Narayanaswamy.

In considering claim 35, AirMobile discloses a method of redirecting attachments

from a host system to a mobile data communications device, comprising the steps of:

Receiving a plurality of data items at the host system, the plurality of data items

including one or more attachments (pp. 44-45, i.e. text and file attachments);

Determining the attachment type for each of the attachments (i.e. filtering based

on the type of attachment, text or file);

Determining whether the mobile data communication device should process the

attachments based on the determined attachment type (i.e. it checks whether the

attachment boxes were selected); and

If so, then redirecting the one or more attachments to the mobile device (i.e. if the

box is checked, the attachment is forwarded to the user's mobile device).

However, AirMobile does not disclose that the attachment profile includes the

attachments that the mobile device *can* process. AirMobile instead discloses that the

user can arbitrarily select which attachments should be sent to the mobile device.

Nonetheless, the use of an attachment profile to determine whether to forward

attachments to a mobile device based on the types of attachments that the device can

process (i.e. based on mobile device characteristics) is well known, as evidenced by

Narayanaswamy. In a similar art, Narayanaswamy discloses a system for forwarding

attachments to a mobile device, wherein the system looks at a mobile device id and

compares it to an attachment profile to determine whether to forward the attachment

directly to the mobile device or whether to convert the attachment first before forwarding

it to the mobile device (col. 5, lines 47-67; col. 6, lines 5-20). Given this teaching, a

person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and

advantages of using a device-based attachment profile such as described by

Narayanaswamy instead of, or in addition to the user-selectable attachment profile

taught by AirMobile, so that attachments that cannot be processed by the mobile device

are not sent to it, thereby reducing the amount of wasted network bandwidth.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the device-based attachment profile

taught by Narayanaswamy in the message forwarding system taught by AirMobile.

Furthermore, the combined system of AirMobile and Narayanaswamy does not

disclose sending the attachments that cannot be processed at the mobile device to a

separate device for processing. Nonetheless, sending messages to an appropriate

external device for processing is well known, as evidenced by Srinivasan. In a similar

art, Srinivasan discloses a system for forwarding e-mails messages to users, wherein

the messages are sent to an appropriate device for processing, according to message

and device characteristics (col. 2, lines 49-61, "messages may be routed to a variety of

different types of destinations also including, but not limited to, facsimile machines,

pager systems, voice mail systems..."). Given the teaching of Srinivasan, a person

having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and

advantages of allowing the attachments in the system taught by AirMobile and

Narayanaswamy to be sent to external devices, so that only device-compatible

messages are received at the mobile device, while non-compatible messages can still

be viewed via other devices, thereby providing optimum flexibility for routing of different

types of messages (see Srinivasan, col. 1, lines 41-45). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to forward certain attachments to external devices, as taught by Srinivasan, in

the message forwarding system taught by AirMobile and Narayanaswamy.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

For all correspondences: (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Bradley Edelman

BE
December 30, 2003